

So with the changes that are being made, I am looking forward to supporting it. I certainly think we should all look and see what is in the best interest of the United States and should be aware of the fact that what they are seeing out there in terms of the cost of this bill is exactly the same cost as if we had done it the way we were supposed to do it. If we add up the total number of appropriations that we passed out—all 12 appropriations—add them up, and that is the same amount as this bill we will be voting on tomorrow. So that criticism is not a genuine criticism.

With that, I will move to another subject that I think is very significant, and then I want to join with my friend from New Mexico.

TSCA MODERNIZATION ACT OF 2015

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 143, H.R. 2576.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2576) to modernize the Toxic Substances Control Act, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Inhofe substitute amendment, which is at the desk, be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, be read a third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 2932) in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Text of Amendments.")

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. INHOFE. I know of no further debate on this measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (H.R. 2576), as amended, was passed.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, we had a very dear friend in Frank Lautenberg. He was a Democrat; I am a Republican. I chaired the committee he served on, and we had a very close relationship.

The bill we just passed began with a meeting to gather stakeholders. It happened in my office with Frank Lautenberg. Senator VITTER and Senator UDALL—whom we will hear from in just a moment—and their staff have put together the first reform of TSCA in 40

years, which will create more regulatory certainty for American businesses and uniform protections for American families.

We have a real opportunity to enact reform to a major environmental statute. It is the result of over 3 years of work and negotiation, and I thank those responsible for spending countless hours to produce this product. Dimitri Karakitsos began working for me while I was ranking member, stayed with Ranking Member VITTER working on this bill, and then back with me as chairman of the committee. He has shepherded the drafting and negotiation of this bill the entire time. He is the guy in charge. I thank Jonathan Black in Senator UDALL's office as well as Andrew Wallace, who took up the TSCA reform leadership following Senator Lautenberg. I thank Zack Baig in Senator VITTER's office, Colin Peppard with Senator CARPER, Michal Feedhoff in Senator MARKEY's office, Adam Zipkin in Senator BOOKER's office, Adrian Deveny in Senator MERKLEY's office, and Emily Enderle with Senator WHITEHOUSE. Thanks to all the staff.

People don't realize how much work the staff does. When we passed the Transportation reauthorization bill, it was hundreds and hundreds of hours. This one, because of a technicality, has been held up for about a month and a half. That has been worked out, so I am just pleased we are able to do it. I think that is a tribute to Frank Lautenberg and his wife Bonnie. I say to my friend from New Mexico, I think Frank Lautenberg's legacy has been fulfilled.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, I couldn't agree with Chairman INHOFE more. I know he knew Senator Lautenberg very well and worked with him on the committee and off the committee on a variety of issues. He was very committed to his grandchildren. As Senator INHOFE knows, many times we would see him in committee, and when he would talk specifically about the bills before us, he would say: Is this going to help my children and their children? One of the things he talked about on this bill was that this would save more lives and help his grandchildren's generation more than any bill he ever worked on. So he was very proud of this bill, and we were very sorry to lose him.

But the thing I want to say about Chairman INHOFE is that as a dedicated and determined legislator, he saw the opportunity. Senator VITTER and I had worked on this. We came to Senator INHOFE at the beginning of the Congress and said: We have a good bipartisan piece of legislation we have worked on for a while. But you took the bull by the horns. You ended up helping us improve it. I think when we started in the committee—when you marked it up earlier in the year in the Environment and Public Works Committee, we had maybe one or two Democrats supporting it. We expanded

that, and it passed out with a 15-to-5 vote, so a very significant vote in terms of holding people together.

I really give you a lot of credit for the way you ran the committee, how gracious you were when Senator Lautenberg's widow, Bonnie Lautenberg, came down and spoke, and I wasn't on the committee any longer, but how you treated me and had me speak before the committee on the work we had done. It has been a real pleasure.

All those staff members you mentioned—from Dimitri, to Jonathan Black, to Drew Wallace, and all the other staff members of the large number of Senators on the committee—Senator CARPER, Senator WHITEHOUSE, Senator MERKLEY, Senator MARKEY, Senator BOOKER—many Senators on that committee focused in with you and with Senator VITTER to make sure we got this done.

I am very proud of what we have done today. I think it will be looked back on as a major environmental accomplishment in terms of bipartisanship and pulling people together.

The thing we did that I am very proud of is we had all stakeholders at the table and we listened to them and we proceeded through. It is a real tribute to Senator INHOFE's ability as a legislator. We don't have to be convinced on this bill. Just earlier in the year, he produced a transportation bill—which was a major accomplishment—for 5 years. So now once again Chairman INHOFE shows how he is able to pull people together and get this done.

So I once again just want to thank you. I know there are additional comments we will make later on. I know the Lautenberg family has followed this closely. Bonnie Lautenberg has followed this. They are going to be very proud.

As you know, we are naming the legislation after Frank Lautenberg. It is going to be called the Frank Lautenberg Chemical Safety Act of 2015. So all of us who served with Frank Lautenberg are going to be very happy and proud that this significant major piece of legislation will carry his name.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, in response, let me say that Senator UDALL is far too generous to me, but I can assure you right now that Bonnie Lautenberg is watching this. We would not have been able to do this if you had not provided the leadership in the Democrats. You kept bringing more and more people in, making modest changes, and I was quite shocked at some that came in. But you and Bonnie were the leaders.

This bill is so significant to every manufacturer, everyone who does any kind of business. We will now finally get a handle on and be able to analyze what chemicals are in the best interest of America and the best safety interests of our people. I thank Senator UDALL so much for his participation and bringing the group together.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

COMMENDING SENATOR INHOFE AND SENATOR ISAKSON

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, before I talk about some of the issues I want to raise this evening on the floor, I wish to make a quick comment about having the opportunity to watch two outstanding Members of this body: Senator INHOFE, whom I happen to sit on the EPW Committee with—and all the great work he has done this year, TSCA, the highway bill—and then watching Senator ISAKSON as well, chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. I have the honor of sitting on that committee. He just went over the great work he has been leading on in terms of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

It has been a real honor to sit and watch Chairman INHOFE and Chairman ISAKSON, two amazing Members of this body. As a new Senator, it has been a privilege to be on both of the committees and watch their work. It is a real pleasure. Thank you.

NUCLEAR AGREEMENT WITH IRAN

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I know there is a lot going on today: the spending bill, the budget. They are very critical to our country. There is certainly a lot of focus on that. A lot of people are spending a lot of time, myself included, digging into that agreement, but the news yesterday on Iran also deserves our attention. Reuters reported that Iran, according to the U.N. Security Council panel of experts, violated U.N. Security Council Resolution 1929 when it tested a ballistic missile capable of delivering a nuclear warhead in October. They said it was a violation of a U.N. Security Council resolution. They are looking at—and it is probably likely, what you see here—the Iranians also launched another ballistic missile in November. That is also another likely violation of a U.N. Security Council resolution.

I made some remarks on the floor a few days ago about Iran and about the nuclear deal. I reminded my colleagues that one of the selling points by the President and by Secretary Kerry about this deal was they were making the case that it was likely to improve Iran's behavior: bring them into the community of nations, get them to behave more like a normal country and not the world's largest sponsor of terrorism, which it currently is.

Since the signing of the nuclear deal, which we debated on this floor, Iran's behavior has only gotten worse. Examples are very numerous. Leaders of the country continue to hold rallies, chanting: "Death to America," "Death to Israel." Iran continues to fund Hezbollah—one of its terrorist proxies around the world—hundreds of millions of dollars. It violated U.N. Security Council resolutions that prevent the

Quds Force commander, General Soleimani, from traveling. He actually traveled to Russia to meet with Mr. Putin to talk about arms trade, in likely a violation of another security council resolution.

The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff recently said that up to 2,000 Iranian troops are in Syria helping to keep the Assad regime in power, working with the Russians on that.

Something that we can never forget, probably the worst outrage that we have seen, all since the signing of the nuclear agreement a couple of months ago, is that in a direct affront to the United States and our citizens, Iran is still holding five Americans against their will. They took another American hostage since the signing of this agreement. One of them is a marine. One of them is a pastor. One of them is a Washington Post reporter. They are all fellow American citizens.

As we prepare for the holidays, when families come together, when friends come together, the President and Secretary Kerry should be working day and night on the phone, every instrument of American power, to try and release these Americans, but that certainly doesn't seem to be happening.

All of this has taken place since the signing of the agreement. All of this is proof enough that the Iran nuclear deal certainly didn't change Iran's behavior for the better. To the contrary, it is becoming increasingly clear that the Obama administration's deal with Iran has only emboldened Iran to take more provocative action against the United States, our citizens, and our allies.

Iran's leaders are testing us. It is clear they are testing us right now. How we respond to these tests is critical. As noted, Iran's missile launches on October 11 clearly violated U.N. Security Council Resolution 1921. The one on November 21 likely did as well. What does this mean? What does this mean for the current Iran nuclear deal that was recently signed? What are the implications on moving forward with that deal? What are the implications of this activity on moving forward with that deal?

I believe a strong argument can be made that these actions by Iran mean they are already violating the spirit and the intent of the nuclear agreement that this body just voted on a few months ago—already.

Former Secretary of State and former U.S. Senator Hillary Clinton actually predicted this just last week when she stated: They are going to violate it. They are going to violate the nuclear agreement, and when they do, we need to respond quickly and very harshly.

That was the former Secretary of State, former Member of this body. I think Secretary Clinton was right on this.

President Obama himself indicated that there is definitely a tie between the Iranian nuclear deal from his administration and Iran's use of ballistic

missile activities. As a matter of fact, the President in a press conference clearly stated that the prohibitions on these activities were part of the nuclear agreement, when in July of this year, after the signing of the agreement, President Obama stated:

What I said to our negotiators was . . . let's press for a longer extension of the arms embargo and the ballistic missile prohibitions. And we got that. We got five years in which, under this new agreement, arms coming in and out of Iran are prohibited, and we got eight years for the respective ballistic missiles.

This is the President talking about his nuclear agreement.

To look at another tie between ballistic missiles and the nuclear agreement, you need to look at the U.N. Security Council that implemented the Iran nuclear deal. That is U.N. Security Council Resolution 2231. That is replacing some of the other U.N. security council resolutions, and it is the legal framework for the nuclear deal that this body debated and approved. Here is what U.N. Security Council Resolution 2231 states: "Iran is called upon not to undertake any activity related to ballistic missiles designed to be capable of delivering nuclear weapons . . . until the date eight years after the JCPOA adoption day."

Again, plain English of the connection. The U.N. Security Council Resolution—that is the international framework for the nuclear deal—says: no ballistic missile activity by Iran.

Yet now we know in no uncertain terms because our U.N. Ambassador, Ambassador Power, just stated that this launch in October was what that U.N. Security Council resolution said Iran couldn't do. She said that launch was inherently capable of delivering a nuclear weapon. Those are a lot of U.N. Security Council resolutions. That is a lot of activity.

Where does that leave us with regard to the Iran nuclear deal? It is obviously clear that Iran just violated U.N. Security Council Resolution 1929. That has already been stated by the panel of experts, by Ambassador Power, and the language of the U.N. Security Council Resolution 2231—the implementation of the U.N. resolution of the Iranian U.N. deal.

This is what I mean when I say that Iran is already violating the spirit and the intent of the Iran nuclear deal. The deal that this body debated a couple of months ago is already being violated by the Iranians.

What should we do? Some of us have already taken action. Thirty-five Members of this body yesterday sent a letter to the President—written by my colleague from New Hampshire, Senator AYOTTE—and it said basically: Mr. President, given these ballistic missile activities, given that Iran is violating U.N. Security Council resolutions that relate to the nuclear agreement, you should not be lifting sanctions.

The Obama administration is talking about lifting sanctions as part of the